



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,873	08/26/2002	Gopal B. Avinash	15-UL-6174	6172
44702	7590	04/05/2006		
OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY & BROITMAN PC 250 PARK AVENUE, SUITE 825 NEW YORK, NY 10177			EXAMINER SETH, MANAV	
			ART UNIT 2624	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/064,873	AVINASH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manav Seth	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2006.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment received on March 09, 2006 has been entered in full.
2. Applicant's amendment to the specification has been entered and based on the amendment objection on the specification has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims as presented in the amendment filed have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments regarding the prior art rejections under Ikeshoji, MacLeod, Bloomberg and Gonzales on pages 9-12 of the Amendment filed on March 09, 2006, have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

5. In the 4th paragraph of the page 10 of the amendment filed, Applicant argues in substance:

a. **"Ikeshoji teaches removing the background from an image, not removing textual annotations from an image"**.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ikeshoji as per the title teaches "method and recording medium for separating and composing background and character image data (textual annotation)" and the same is shown in figure 1. Separating textual annotations from rest of the image, in other

Art Unit: 2624

words, is removing the textual annotations from the image. Therefore, the rejections on the respective claims still stand.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 13 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikeshoji et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,339.

Regarding claims 1, 13 and 30, Ikeshoji discloses removing one or more textual annotations from a grayscale annotated image to derive a first modified image (figure 1; **element 20D** being the first modified image, which is obtained after annotations (elements 30, 32 and 34) are removed; **element 30D** represents removed annotations only with no background image where annotations being textual (characters) (See **Title**; figure 1 clearly says image 30D being character and figure image; col. 2, lines 36-42 discloses characters (textual annotations) are drawn on an image).

Ikeshoji further discloses processing said first modified image (20D) using an algorithm to derive a processed image (col. 5, lines 1-5; removing stains).

Ikeshoji further discloses merging the removed one or more annotations with said processed image to derive a merged image (figure 3, element 10-1 being the merged image).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2-12, 14-21 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeshoji et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,339, further in view of Macleod et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,778,092, and further in view of Bloomberg, U.S. Patent No. 5,065,437.

Claim 2 recites "The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said removing step comprises the following: deriving a first binary mask defining one or more image regions; and multiplying said first binary mask and said annotated image to derive said first modified image". Ikeshoji clearly teaches in figure 1, deriving a first modified image (element 20 D) from which annotations have been removed with the help of filtering (or masking). Removing a part of images by using a mask is very well known in the process of image segmentation where processing such as convolution further involving multiplying mask bits with original image is used and is generally used in differentiating and removing an image part from the original image. Ikeshoji does teach of using a filter or mask but does not specifically teach deriving a binary mask, however, Macleod teaches this generally used well-known method of deriving a binary mask (col. 2, lines 1-13; col. 4, lines 65-68 through col. 5, lines 1-16 and lines 30-68; col. 8, lines 4-10 and lines 25-40).

Further supporting, in lines 57-62 of col. 11, MacLeod discloses that U.S. Patent No. 5,065,437, is incorporated by reference, thereby, not requiring the motivation to combine the references.

Art Unit: 2624

Bloomberg. Bloomberg provides the support for subject matter in claim 2 in (figure 1B,col. 2, lines 20-68; col. 4, lines 1-68; col. 6, lines 10-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to use combined teachings of MacLeod and Bloomberg in the invention of Ikeshoji because all references are directed to image segmentation and the combined MacLeod and Bloomberg's teachings provide the well-known teachings that are generally used in image segmentation, which would further provide a robust and computationally efficient technique for identifying and separating regions (See Bloomberg, col. 2, lines 5-15).

Claim 3 recites "The method as recited in claim 2, wherein said merging step comprises the following" inverting said first binary mask to derive a second binary mask defining one or more annotation regions; multiplying said second binary mask and annotated image to derive a second modified image; and merging said second modified image and said processed image to derive said merged image". Ikeshoji clearly shows in figure 1, deriving images 20D and 30D, where in image 20D annotations are removed and in image 30D only annotations are present, therefore these 2 images are clearly subject to the apparent use of a mask that when inverted would provide segmentation for extracting one part or the other from the original image. Figure 3 clearly shows merging said second modified image (30) and said processed image (20) to derive said merged image.

Claim 4 recites "The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the merged textual annotations occupy the same pixels in said merged image that the removed textual annotations originally occupied in said annotated image". Ikeshoji clearly shows in figure 3 the image 10-1 which has

Art Unit: 2624

annotation at the same image position as shown in figure 1 image 10 and further support can be found in (col. 4, lines 6-12).

Claim 5 recites “the method as recited in claim 1, wherein said removing step comprises morphology-based processing and thresholding”. MacLeod discloses dilation and erosion (morphological operations) (col. 7) and further teaches thresholding (col. 5).

Claim 6 recites “The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said removing step comprising the following: grayscale erosion of said annotated image using a structuring element to derive an eroded image; thresholding said eroded image to derive a first binary mask; dilation of said first binary mask using said structuring element to derive a second binary mask defining one or more image regions; and multiplying said second binary mask and said annotated image to derive said first modified image”. The subject matter recited in the claim 6 is nothing but a morphological operation (opening: erosion followed by dilation), which is very well-known to be used in the process of identifying and separating image portions. MacLeod clearly teaches all the steps recited in claim 6 in (col. 11 through col. 12, lines 1-55). Bloomberg further provides the support in (col. 9, lines 45-68 through col. 10, lines 1-25).

Regarding claim 7, citing the well-known fact of modifying the image using an image mask, and in further view of Ikeshoji providing merging of images as explained before in the rejection of claim 3. Claim 7 has been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claims 3 and 6.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 8, MacLeod discloses said removing step comprises thresholding and pixel connectivity-based analysis” (col. 6, lines 44-56). See Bloomberg (col. 2, lines 28-60; col. 4, lines 40-65; col. 7, lines 1-65).

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 additionally recites the limitation where “**using 8-connected analysis to reject segments smaller than a prespecified size** from said first binary mask to derive a second binary mask”. MacLeod discloses of the same in (col. 6, lines 44-56; col. 10, lines 1-40). All other limitations have been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claims 1-8.

Regarding claim 10, claim 10 has been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claims 9, 7 and 3.

Regarding claim 11, claim 11 in addition to claim 9 recites “removing holes from a second binary mask to derive a third binary mask”. MacLeod teaches mask reconstruction for filling (removing) the interior holes (col. 11, lines 63-68 through col. 12, lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 12, Ikeshoji discloses filtering to enhance said first modified image (col. 6, lines 10-20).

Claims 14-21 have been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claims 2-12.

Claim 31 and 32 have been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claims 2-3.

Art Unit: 2624

10. Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeshoji et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,339, further in view of Macleod et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,778,092, and further in view of Bloomberg, U.S. Patent No. 5,065,437 and further in view of Gonzales et al., 1992, Book publication "Digital image processing".

As discussed before in the rejection of claims 1-12, the combined invention of Ikeshoji, MacLeod and Bloomberg provides techniques that are used on grayscale images. Now the question is, can the same techniques be used on color images? The answer would be yes and further support is provided by Gonzales. Gonzales teaches "the HIS model is ideally suited for image enhancement, because the intensity component is decoupled from the color information in an image. Therefore any monochrome enhancement technique can be carried over as a tool for enhancing full-color images. It simply calls for converting the image to the HIS format, processing the intensity component, and converting the result to RGB for display" (page 247, 4th paragraph) and apparently the HS components would have to be merged back in as the processing is done on color images and the output required would be a color image. Also, converting an RGB to HSI and HSI to RGB model is very well known and is further taught by Gonzales on page 229 and 235. Therefore, providing a motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Gonzales's teachings in the combined invention of Ikeshoji, MacLeod and Bloomberg. All other limitations of claims 22 and 26 have been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claims 1-12.

Claims 23-24 and 27-28 have been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claims 2-3, 22 and 26.

Claims 25 and 29 have been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claims 22 and 26.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manav Seth whose telephone number is (571) 272-7456. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta, can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2624

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manav Seth
Art Unit 2625
March 31, 2006



BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600